



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,976	12/15/2004	Josephus Arnoldus Henricus Maria Kahlman	NL 020577	1953
24737	7590	08/23/2006	EXAMINER	
PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS P.O. BOX 3001 BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510			JEAN PIERRE, PEGUY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2819	

DATE MAILED: 08/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/517,976		KAHLMAN, JOSEPHUS ARNOLDUS HENRICUS MAR	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Peguy JeanPierre		2819	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 July 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 7/31/2006 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because the preferred layout of the specification is missing. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to because the handwritten reference characters of the replacement sheets are not legible. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show N codewords having a neutral or zero running disparity as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet"

pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

4. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations of "...a running digital sum of each group of N adjacent code words equal to zero". This limitation is not adequately described in the specification nor shown in the drawings. Figure 3 does not show any adjacent codewords whose running disparity is zero. A coding algorithm or scheme is missing in the specification. The specification is silent about the number of bits in each codeword; how the group of N code words is formed. The specification must clearly state how the coded data is combined to form a RDS of zero disparity or whether additional bits are further inserted in the coded data to arrive at this neutral disparity. For instance, in Figure 3, adjacent codewords 35 and 35a generate a negative disparity. As for Figure 4, adjacent codewords 42 and 42a may generate a zero disparity based on the graph,

Art Unit: 2819

however, adjacent codewords 42a and 43 will not yield a zero disparity. Hence, the limitation that N adjacent codewords yield zero disparity is misleading. In addition, the content or composition or number of bits of codewords pair 42 and 42a and so on must be shown or display in the box to help in understanding the formation of the codewords.

No new matter should be added.

5. Claims 1-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In claim 1 is unclear. For the coded data does not have an RDS (running digital sum) of "0". Furthermore, the tables of Figures 5 and 6 and claims 7, 8, 16, 17, 22 are misleading because their RDSs are not equal to zero. In addition, the added limitation of "combined running...N adjacent codewords equals zero" has no support in the specification.

In claims 23-25, it is not clear whether the "In" column represents the codeword or the "Out" column represents the decoded word. Does the table recited in the claim represent data that are added to the codeword or to the decoded word to maintain a predetermined running disparity? Please explain.

Response to Arguments


6. Applicant's arguments filed on 7/31/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The rejection of the claims has been maintained. The preferred layout of the specification has not been addressed. The added limitation in claim 1 of "combined running ...N adjacent codewords equals zero" has no support in the specification. The

Art Unit: 2819

drawings as illustrated hardly provide adequate support for the claims and/or the specification. The claims must be re-drafted in a clear and concise manner to help the Examiner in understanding the invention.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peguy JeanPierre whose telephone number is (571) 272-1803/272-1803. The examiner fax phone number is (571) 273-1803.


Peguy JeanPierre
Primary Examiner